

PREPOSITIONS IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: ON THE RISE OF A NOVEL SYSTEM
PREPOSIÇÕES NO PORTUGUÊS BRASILEIRO: SOBRE O SURGIMENTO DE UM NOVO SISTEMA

Heloisa Maria Moreira Lima Salles¹

ABSTRACT

The study examines the prepositional system of Brazilian Portuguese, considering the loss of the dative preposition *a* (to) in constructions with dative arguments and differential object marking (DOM), as well as in unaccusatives predicates with directional motion verbs. It is argued that the occurrence of *para* (to) in both ditransitive predicates and predicates with motion verbs as well as the convergence of the preposition *em* (in) in the grammatical encoding of both inessive and allative interpretation point to their morphosyntactic identity in the relevant contexts. This hypothesis stems on Manzini; Franco's (2016) unified analysis of dative as well as DOM constructions, in which the relevant argument is licensed in the projection of a prepositional head that introduces an inclusiveness/ possession relation with either the *theme* argument in ditransitive predicates or the embedded nominal layer in the internal structure of the event in monotransitive predicates, which amounts to the syntactic expression of oblique case. This analysis is extended to unaccusative predicates with motion verbs, in which the spatial preposition introduces a relation between the *theme* argument and the locative argument in the internal structure of the predicate.

KEYWORDS: Prepositions. Oblique case. Structural case. Locatives.

RESUMO

Este estudo examina o sistema preposicional no Português Brasileiro, considerando a perda da preposição *a* em construções ditransitivas com argumento dativo e em construções de marcação diferencial do objeto (DOM), assim como em predicados bi-argumentais inacusativos com verbos de movimento direcional. Argumenta-se que a ocorrência da preposição *para* tanto em predicados ditransitivos como em predicados com verbos inacusativos de movimento, bem como a convergência da preposição *em* na codificação gramatical da interpretação inessiva e alativa apontam para a identidade morfossintática dessa categoria nos contextos citados. Essa hipótese toma por base a análise unificada de Manzini; Franco (2016) para construções com argumentos dativos e construções DOM, em que o argumento relevante é licenciado na projeção de um núcleo preposicional que introduz uma relação de inclusividade/ posse com o argumento *tema*, em predicados bitransitivos, ou com a camada nominal da estrutura interna do evento, em predicados monotransitivos, o que corresponde à expressão sintática do caso oblíquo. Essa análise é estendida a predicados inacusativos bi-argumentais, com verbos de movimento, em que a preposição espacial relaciona o argumento *tema* e o argumento locativo, na estrutura interna do predicado.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Preposições. Caso oblíquo. Caso estrutural. Locativo.

¹ Professora Associada, Universidade de Brasília (UnB), hsalles@unb.br, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4190-1804>.

Introduction²

The present study investigates the morphosyntax of prepositions in Brazilian Portuguese (BP), taking into consideration the loss of the preposition *a* (to), giving rise to innovative uses of the preposition *para* (to), in the grammatical encoding of dative and locative case (cf. (1), (2a), (2b)), as well as the absence of the preposition in monotransitive contexts involving the dative argument (cf. (3)).³

- (1) Maria entregou o livro *para* João. (<ao João)
- (2) a. Maria foi *para* o mercado/ *no* mercado. (<ao mercado)
 b. Maria veio *para* o mercado/ *no* mercado. (<ao mercado)
- (3) Maria agradou __ o amigo. (<ao amigo)

The working hypothesis is that the innovative uses involving the generalized loss of the preposition *a* both in dative and locative contexts and the related substitution for the preposition *para* point to their morphosyntactic identity – despite distinctions with respect to theta roles. This analysis is also confirmed in predicates with a single internal argument, in which dative and Differential Object Marking (DOM) constructions are not found, the loss of the preposition *a* implying a type of structural reduction.

The discussion will be developed as follows. In Section 1, we will discuss the syntax of prepositions – reviewing the distinction between structural and inherent/ oblique Case. In Section 2, an analysis of the innovative uses of the preposition in ditransitive and dative/DOM monotransitive constructions is provided, in which it is assumed that the relevant argument is realized as an oblique argument within a P projection, in terms of Manzini; Franco (2016) and Franco; Manzini's (2017) analyses of genitives, datives and instrumentals. This analysis is followed by an account of the innovative use of the preposition *em* (in) introducing allative locatives in motion predicates, giving rise to an alignment with inessive locatives in stative predicates in BP, further allowing for a unified approach with respect to datives in ditransitive predicates. In turn the loss of the preposition *a* in constructions with dative/ DOM arguments is analysed as structural reduction. While the former are analysed as instances of an innovative encoding of oblique case in a configuration involving two

² I would like to express my gratitude to Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva and Cilene Rodrigues, for their leadership in the Grupo de Trabalho “Teoria da Gramática” da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação de Letras e Linguística (GTTG/ ANPOLL) 2020-22, which rendered it possible to gather ideas and new prospects for our field. I am also grateful to the audience of the GTTG/ANPOLL meeting, which was held in October, 2021, and to the anonymous reviewers, for their insightful comments to this article. All errors are my own.

³ It should be noticed that the preposition *a* may be found in BP, particularly in connection with the Standard language. Moreover, the preposition *a* may be found in some dialects of BP, depending on the construction (cf. SALLES; SCHERRE, 2003). We will assume that the facts illustrated in (1)-(3) correspond to the preferred pattern, following various studies investigating the syntax of the preposition in ditransitive predicates as well as in unaccusative predicates with motion verbs (which will be quoted in the course of the discussion). It will be further shown that the innovative facts concerning the prepositional system in BP do not reduce to the choice of the lexical items, as they involve structural and categorial reanalysis.

internal arguments, the latter is analysed as an instance of objective/ structural case, under the loss of animacy marking on the relevant DP.

1. On the syntax of prepositions

1.1. Lexical and functional prepositions and the grammatical distinction between structural and inherent Case

As is well known, prepositions have been widely investigated from different theoretical perspectives, which systematically converge in treating them as relational items, thus allowing for a parallel with grammatical/ functional categories.⁴ However, their role as lexical categories has been also postulated in terms of their ability to occur as predicates, thus defining an argument structure.

These contrastive properties have been noted back in Chomsky (1965, p. 101) in relation to the ambiguous interpretation of the construction in (1), in which the prepositional phrase may occur as either an internal argument/ complement or an adjunct: while in the latter case the preposition is a lexical head selecting the argument ‘the boat’, in the former case, the argument ‘the boat’ is selected by the verb – possibly under a compositional relation with the preposition ‘on’.

- (4) John decided on the boat.

The idea that V and P enter a compositional relation in theta role assignment is assumed in Chomsky (1981, p. 93), in the following terms (see also JACKENDOFF, 1990):

[...] each lexical element alpha assigns a theta-role to every NP or clause in its complement (if there are any), including NP in PP linked to alpha, in which case the theta-role will be determined compositionally by alpha and the P head of PP.

- (I) promise NP – S (*promise John that S/ to VP*)
- (II) promise NP – NP (*promise John victory*)
- (III) promise NP – PP (*promise victory to John*).

The structural conditions concerning theta-assignment are taken to extend to all lexical categories, as part of their specification, which include abstract morpho-phonological structure as well as their syntactic projection. In turn, the categorial properties of P are formulated in terms of a system based on the features [+/-V] and [+/-N], in which P is defined as [-V, -N], N as [+N, -V], V as [-N, +V], and A as [+N, +A] (cf. CHOMSKY, 1981).

⁴ A more neutral designation should be ‘adposition’, as it is the cover label for its prenominal and postnominal occurrence. We shall retain the label ‘preposition’, as most examples referred in the present study involve the prenominal positioning.

Other properties have been proposed in the analysis of P within the generative framework. In particular, the distinction between lexical and functional prepositions was formalized in the GB framework, in Chomsky's (1986) revision of Case theory. Assuming Vergnaud's idea according to which all languages are subject to a core system of Case assignment on nominal phrases, morphological realization being restricted to some, the author distinguishes "the 'structural Cases', objective and nominative, assigned at the S-structure level, from the 'inherent Cases' assigned at D-structure" (CHOMSKY, 1986, p. 193). While inherent Case includes oblique and genitive Case, being assigned by prepositions and nouns/adjectives, respectively – under theta-marking –, *structural* Case is assigned by verbs and INFL, independently of *theta*-marking.

Chomsky's (1986, p. 193) conclusion is that "[n]ow all lexical categories assign Case: P, N and A assign inherent Case at D-structure; whereas V (along with INFL containing AGR) assigns structural Case at S-structure". The association of inherent Case and *theta*-marking includes the distinction between *Case assignment* and *Case realization*, which arises in genitive Case marking. Genitive Case is assigned (by N and A) to the argument in complement position at D-Structure (cf. (5a) and (6a)), and is realized under '*of*-insertion' at S-structure (cf. (5b) and (6b)), a possession (POSS) marker being also possible in (5c) (not relevant for the present discussion):

- | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| (5) | a. | construction [the city] | [D-structure] |
| | b. | construction [<i>of</i> -the city] | [S-structure] |
| | b'. | [the city]'s destruction <i>e</i> | |
| (6) | a. | proud [John] | [D-structure] |
| | b. | proud [<i>of</i> -John] | [S-structure] |

According to Chomsky (1986, p. 194), '*of*-insertion' "[...] is a 'default case', applying only when there is no preposition available that inherently assigns the appropriate *theta*-role". In (7), the preposition 'to' inherently assigns Case to the argument bearing the *goal* role, exactly as in the verbal counterpart in (7).

- (7) Our promise to John

A crucial point then is that the preposition assigning inherent case is inserted at the base component (D-structure), as a lexically determined property, while the so-called *default* preposition is inserted at the surface structure (S-structure), as a functional category. A related fact is that languages differ in the expression of the latter property, allowing alternatively for the occurrence of a (genitive) case affix. This marking in turn may extend to other contexts, giving rise to the so-called case system, as found in Latin, Greek and many other languages.

A related question is whether prepositions and case affixes are grammatical equivalents. This problem has been investigated in previous studies, leading to the conclusion that P is an independent

category, with the ability to project its features as a head, in terms of a theory of phrase structure. A relevant argument is put forward in Riemsdijk's (1990, p. 17) seminal work on the categorial status of PP.

[...] A preposition may select in its complement another PP, *from behind the door*, but an NP in a certain case may never be in the complement of another 'case marker'. [...] Case on one NP may influence or dictate case agreement or case attraction. [...] P can never be distributed inside the NP onto the determiner, the adjective, the noun, the way case is in many languages.

The author also observes that there is a many-to-many relation between syntactic categories and semantic functions, as can be shown, for instance, by the fact that "a function like manner can be expressed by different syntactic categories. [...] Examples are 'We'll do it *the right way*' (NP); 'He should do it *in a different manner*' (PP)" (RIEMSDJIK, 1990, p. 24). We shall assume the above-mentioned conclusions about the categorial status of P, further noting that case affixes may be analysed as independent syntactic heads, thus having their own projection, namely K(ase)P, as proposed in Bittner and Hale (1996), a matter that we will not take into consideration presently.

Regarding the above-mentioned distinction between lexical and functional prepositions, in terms of the level at which it is inserted, whether D- or S-Structure, it should be noted that it cannot be formulated within the Minimalist framework, as these levels of representation are not at stake, under the so-called Strong Minimalist Thesis (SMT). The SMT is stated in Chomsky (2004, p. 3) as follows:

(...) language is an optimal solution to interface conditions that FL must satisfy; that is, language is an optimal way to link sound and meaning, where these notions are given a technical sense in terms of the interface systems that enter into the use and interpretation of expressions generated by an I-language.

A linguistic expression is then a formal object satisfying the interpretive conditions of both interfaces, as determined by the condition on Full Interpretation. Accordingly, the interface levels consist of the rearrangement of the properties of the lexical items (under (external) Merge and (internal) Merge), thus dispensing the intermediate levels of representation, and excluding any feature extraneous to the ones characterized as the properties of sound and meaning (*inclusiveness*). In particular, the derivations proceed as generalized transformations, in order to generate the grammatical descriptions for the relevant interfaces, namely the Logical Form (LF) and the Phonological Form (PF) (cf. CHOMSKY 1995, 2001). Accordingly, the GB Case system based on Case assignment and realization, by different categories types (namely, functional T, as opposed to V and P) cannot be formulated in terms of the properties of the interfaces.

A comprehensive discussion on the development of case theory is provided in Pesetsky and Torrego (2012, p. 1), who observe that "the phenomenon of case represents one of the more outstanding challenges for the minimalist conjecture", due to the well-established conclusion that

case is not interpretable at the interfaces. As noted by the authors, a crucial development in the Minimalist approach to abstract Case, stems from Burzio's (1981, 1986) generalization, which states that if a verb licenses accusative case, it has an external argument. In particular, it is assumed that the projection of a transitive predicate includes a functional v projection, which selects VP, being responsible not only for introducing the external thematic argument (as proposed in Hale and Keyser 1993), but also for licensing accusative (ACC) on the internal DP argument. Given this, a unification with nominative case is obtained, as it is also licensed by a functional head, namely T. Nominative and accusative case are then analysed as a by-product of the so-called *Agree* operation, which eliminates uninterpretable features on T and v , under checking against their interpretable counterparts on DP, as required by Full Interpretation.

Pesetsky and Torrego (2012) further observe that while structural Case arises as a property of (finite) T and v , members of 'lexical' categories – for example, specific verbs – in many languages, may require dative case on their complement (e. g. Latin, Icelandic, Warlpiri), dispensing with a structural licenser such as abstract case. Accordingly, dative case is lexically determined, and a condition on its occurrence is that the relevant nominal be selected as an argument. This property is referred in the generative literature as inherent case, as already seen. Its special nature has been widely investigated, with relevant results for the understanding of the variety of case systems and case types. This is illustrated with data from Russian.

- (8) Ivan pomog studentam (Russian)
 Ivan helped student.DAT.PL 'Ivan helped the student'.

(example from PESETSKY; TORREGO, 2012, p. 10)

We shall assume Chomsky's (1995, 2001) view on structural Case, as the reflex of an *Agree* relation between the relevant DP argument and a phase head, either v or *C-T*, implying accusative or nominative case, respectively. In this sense, the relevant morphosyntactic properties are projected from the lexicon in the syntactic structure, by the core operations of the grammar, namely *Merge* (whether external or internal) and *Agree*.

In what follows we will provide a brief outline of Manzini; Franco's (2016) as well as Franco; Manzini (2017) approaches to dative/ genitive/DOM obliques and instrumentals, which are identified by a common property, namely that of *inclusion/ part-whole/ possession*. We shall extend their analysis to obliques in BP.

1.2. Oblique case as P-projections denoting *possession/ inclusion/ part-whole*

In this section we shall briefly outline Manzini; Franco's (2016) view on oblique case, on which our analysis of the innovative properties of BP prepositional system is based. In the discussion we shall include the conclusions of Franco; Manzini's (2017) study on instrumentals, which confirm the

results of the previous article, broadening the empirical import, while pointing to the adequacy of treating obliques as operators denoting a *possession/part-whole* relation. According to their approach, the lexical items (LI) expressing oblique case (whether prepositions or case affix/ particles) project their properties in the syntax, as a way to introduce participants (themes, initiators) in the structure of VP or vP predicates, as can be inferred from the authors' statement.

We take a conservative view under which the lexicon precedes syntax, and in fact projects it, in keeping with the minimalist postulate of Inclusiveness (Chomsky 1995). Correspondingly, the question of how the lexical items involved, including prepositions/ case, interact with one another under syntactic Merge (effectively projecting syntactic structures), becomes interesting, and is in fact crucial. (FRANCO; MANZINI, 2017, p. 6).

In their analysis, the case system reduces to a split between direct/accusative case – also referred as structural Case –, which is a reflex of the *Agree* operation (cf. Section 1.1), and oblique case.⁵ As such, oblique case is a cover name for a number of various case types, which often manifest morphological syncretisms (cf. CAHA, 2009, cited by the authors). These facts have been analysed in terms of case hierarchies, which are meant to account not only for the case types, but also for the morphological clustering. As noted in Franco; Manzini (2017), despite their descriptive effectiveness, the conditions determining these hierarchies imply the determination of the nature of the hierarchy itself, and this question brings back the original point of explaining the case system.⁶

Manzini; Franco's (2016, p. 198) study of Differential Object Marking (DOM)/ dative arguments in Romance provides an investigation on the nature of oblique case, in which they propose that the coincidence in use of the preposition *a* (to), as illustrated in (8), as opposed to (9), is not a matter of morphological opacity, rather it “reflects a real underlying (syntactic and interpretive) identity”. The relevant facts are illustrated with data from the Southern Italian dialect Sasso di Castalda (Italo-Romance), in which (9a) and (9b) illustrate DOM, (9c) illustrates a transitive verb without DOM, and (9d) illustrates the dative argument in a ditransitive predicate :

- (9) a. camene *a* mmi/tti/jidde ‘They call me/you/him.’
 they.call to me/you/him
- b. camene *a* kwedda femmena ‘They call that woman’
 they.call to that woman

⁵ The label ‘direct’ case is used in the original. We quote it as equivalent to accusative case, following the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer.

⁶ Franco and Manzini (2016, p. 6) observe that another way to account for syncretisms is under the Distributed Morphology framework, in which a realizational concept of the lexicon is adopted, along with the assumption that “[...] abstract clusters of features may be realized by certain phonological strings, giving rise to syncretisms, which are treated in terms of underspecification/ impoverishment and other morphological readjustments”. We shall not discuss this alternative view.

- (11) a. EA [CAUSE/ v [parl- [_{P(ε)} a Gianni]]] ‘talk to G.’
 b. EA [CAUSE/ v [parl- [_{Q(ε)} gli]]] ‘talk-3s.CL.DAT’
 c. EA [CAUSE/ v [colp- [_{DP} lo]]] ‘hit-3s.CL.ACC’
- (12) (...) dato [il libro [_{P(ε)} a Gianni]] ‘give the book to G.’

(adapted from MANZINI; FRANCO, 2016, p. 213)

The discussion on the nature of oblique case is further entertained in Franco and Manzini (2017), in which it is argued that the fundamental oblique cases are genitive/ dative and instrumental, starting from Levinson’s (2011, cited by the authors) observation that the instrumental P (*with*), in expressions such as *The woman with the children/ the books*, denote possession, the embedded DP being the *possessum*, while the *possessor* is the head of the DP. Accordingly, they add, “the instrumental inflections/ adpositions denote the reverse relation with respect to genitives or datives, by which the *possessum*, rather than the possessor is in the oblique case.” (p. 3). In the discussion, the syntax of instrumental case/P is investigated, in terms of their basic meanings, namely instrument, causer, comitative, and their relation to the semantic structuring of the event, as reflected by the syntactic categories V, v , Voice.

An important conclusion of the study is that the instrumental P (*with* in English, or *con* in Italian) has “an extremely impoverished meaning”, which simply allows an extra argument in a transitive or intransitive event to be introduced/ included. While animate referents yield a comitative interpretation, inanimate give rise to different readings, depending on the eventive layer at which the adjunct PP is attached (whether causative or resultative) (p. 14). This is summarized in the concluding remarks:

(...) [*w*ith/ *con* PPs can be attached to a VP or a v P predicate; they may be interpreted as generic participants, as plural forming comitatives, as causers, as instruments depending on a rather elementary ontology including the ranking of the event participants in the animacy hierarchy (human/ non-human), and the causative/ resultative nature of the event – as independently highlighted by the literature (FRANCO; MANZINI, 2017, p. 15).

It is then proposed that the instrumental case/P (*with*) corresponds to the reverse relation, “in which a DP is introduced as *possessed/ included* by DP or a state/ event” (FRANCO; MANZINI, 2017, p. 15). This relation can be illustrated with the instrumental/ dative alternation, in which the relevant DP is introduced in opposite directions, by the instrumental P *with*, in (13a), and the dative P *to*, in (13b), respectively.⁸

⁸ It should be noted that Franco; Manzini’s (2017) analysis of instrumentals as involving a reverse relation stems from Hale and Keyser’s (1993) theory of argument structure, in which it is proposed that P is the *default* head of the basic dyadic lexical structure, distinguishing ‘terminal’ and ‘central’ coincidence, and giving rise to the so-called *locatum*

- (13) a. He presented [_{pp} the museum [_{P(=)} with his pictures]]
 b. He presented [_{pp} his pictures [_{P(=)} to the museum]]

In the fundamental oblique system then (genitive-dative-instrumental), the common head, which is characterized as *part/ whole*, provides ways of attaching extra participants in an event (i. e arguments that have accessory causation roles). Another relevant point of this proposal is that the *possession/ part-whole* is independent of locative meaning. As noted by the FRANCO; MANZINI (2017, p. 17),

[...] we see no reason why spatial meanings should be primitive with respect to meanings connected to relations between events or between events and their participants, suggesting that it is in fact spatial relations that may be conceived as specialization of all-purpose relations (contains/ is part of) when a location is involved.

Under this view, it is possible to account for variation in the lexicalization of oblique P occurring in the structure of motion verbs predicates, in which locative meaning/specification on the preposition can be absent – we shall return to these facts.

With this view on oblique case in mind, let us move to the BP facts.

2. The BP facts: the rise of a novel P system

In this section we discuss the rise of a novel P system in the grammatical encoding of the dative argument in ditransitive and monotransitive predicates as well as the locative argument in motion verbs.⁹

2.1. Dative P in ditransitive predicates

As we have mentioned, an innovative feature of Brazilian Portuguese is that the *goal* argument occurs in the projection of the preposition *para*, in ditransitive predicates, as illustrated in (1), repeated here as (14), giving rise to an alignment with predicates introducing the benefactive argument, in which the preposition *para* is found as well, as illustrated in (15).¹⁰ This innovative fact has been

verb (as in ‘provide X with a saddle’/ ‘to saddle X’), and the *location* verb (as in ‘put the book on the shelf’/ ‘to shelf the book’). In Hale; Keyser’ (1993, p. 15) terms, in the terminal coincidence meaning, the incorporated nominal (*shelf*) represents an ‘endpoint’ of motion or transfer of the entity denoted by the variable argument (*the books*), while in the central coincidence meaning, the incorporated argument (*saddle*) corresponds to something which the entity denoted by the variable argument (*the horse*) comes temporarily or permanently to ‘have’ or to ‘wear’, or to ‘be with’.

⁹ The present discussion as well as most of the empirical facts in this section are strongly based in two previous studies, namely Torres Morais; Salles (2010) and Salles; Torres Morais (2020), advancing some ideas, under the framework developed in the previous section.

¹⁰ The alignment with benefactives is confirmed by the ambiguity that arises in (14), in which the argument *João* may be interpreted as either the *goal* of transference or the *beneficiary* from the event, the latter allowing for two readings, namely a transference reading, and a reading in which the external argument *Maria*, in the subject position, performs the event

widely discussed in the literature, in different theoretical approaches (RAMOS, 1992; BERLINCK, 1996; SALLES, 1997, 2016; GOMES, 2003; BERLINCK; TORRES MORAIS, 2006, 2018; FIGUEIREDO SILVA, 2007; TORRES MORAIS; SALLES, 2010; CALINDRO, 2015; SALLES; TORRES MORAIS, 2020, among many others).

(14) Maria entregou o livro *para* João.

‘M. gave a book to John/ him’

(15) Maria preparou um jantar *para* João.

‘M. made dinner for him’

A related fact is that third person clitics are not found in BP, hence the pronoun necessarily occurs in the P projection (cf. 16).¹¹ In first and second person, the clitic pronoun occurs in variation with the full pronoun introduced by P (cf. 17a and 17b).

(16) Maria deu um livro *para* ele.

M. gave the book P_{para} him

(17) a. Maria *me/te* deu o livro.

Maria 1s/2s.CL gave the book

b. Maria deu o livro *pra mim/ pra você*.

Maria gave the book to me/ to you

In double pronominalization, different combinations arise, as the dative clitic and the dative PP occur with the full pronoun in object position and with the accusative clitic, as illustrated in (18).

(18) a. Maria *me*_{DAT} apresentou *ela*_{ACC}.

Maria 1s.CL.DAT introduced she._{ACC}.

b. Maria *me*_{ACC} apresentou *para* ela.

Maria 1s.CL.ACC introduced to her.

Assuming a crosslinguistic perspective, it is worth noting that the preposition *para* is ungrammatical in European Portuguese (EP) in ditransitive predicates denoting transference of possession, although it is found in contexts denoting benefactive reading. In particular, the *goal* argument in EP is obligatorily introduced by the preposition *a* in transfer of possession predicates,

on behalf of the argument introduced by the preposition *para* (for), namely *John*, which implies event modification. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out the relevance of this distinction, leaving the discussion on the syntax of the *beneficiary* argument for future work (on this matter, see CALINDRO, 2021).

¹¹ The loss of third person clitics in BP is a well investigated topic within the generative framework, with relevant contributions. I refer Roberts; Kato's (1993) pioneer collection of studies, as well as Galves' (2003) essays, and the references therein, which include the facts about the pronominal system, providing inspiring background for the subsequent work on the rise of Brazilian Portuguese grammar.

while the *benefactive* argument may be introduced either by *a* or *para* (cf. (19a), as opposed to (19b)). Moreover, in BP, *para* hosts the complete series of full pronouns in both ditransitive and benefactive predicates, while in EP they are freely allowed only in benefactive predicates introduced the preposition *para* (cf. RAPOSO, 2013).

- (19) a. A Maria deu o livro *a*/**para* o João.
M. gave the book P_{goal} J.
b. A Maria fez o bolo *ao* João/ *para* o João.
M. baked the cake P_{goal} J./ for J.
- (20) a. A Maria deu o livro *para* mim / nós/ ele(s)/ela(s). (BP/*EP)
M. gave the book to me/ us/ him/ her/ them
b. A Maria fez um bolo *para* mim/ nós/ ele(s)/ela(s). (BP/ EP)
M. baked the cake for me/ us/ him/ her/ them

As noted in Torres Morais (2006), in EP, in the presence of the full pronoun introduced by the dative preposition *a*, clitic doubling is required – whether in ditransitives or benefactives constructions:

- (21) a. A Maria deu-*(me) *a mim* o livro [**para* mim]
b. A Maria deu-*(te) *a ti* o livro [**para* ti]
c. A Maria deu-*(lhe) *a ele* o livro [**para* ele]
M. gave-1s/2s/3s.CL the book P_a me/you/him [*P_{para} me/you/him]
- (22) A Maria fez-*(lhe) *a ele* um bolo [**para* ele]
M. baked-3s.CL P_a him a cake [*P_{para} him]

A related fact is that the strong pronoun may occur in the PP projection, as a repair strategy in double pronominalization in EP, whenever the accusative argument is not a third person pronoun (**me te*; **te me*; **lhe me/te*), given that clitic clusters are subject to the Person-Case Constraint (PCC). However, the preposition *para* (to) is excluded (cf. (23)).

- (23) A Maria te_{ACC} apresentou *a mim*. [**para* mim]
M. 2s.CL introduced P_a me. [*P_{para} mim]

The above-mentioned conditions on clitic doubling and the occurrence of the repair strategy under double pronominalization in EP are tangential to the present discussion. In Torres Morais; Salles (2010) and Salles; Torres Morais' (2020) analyses, these facts point to a grammatical implication between the (dative) clitic and the preposition *a*, thus allowing for a distinction between the preposition *a* as a dative marker and its occurrence in other types of oblique case. We shall not pursue this conclusion at this point.

According to Salles' (1997) analysis, the occurrence of the lexical preposition *para* introducing the *goal* argument in ditransitive constructions further relates to the loss of the third person accusative/

dative distinction in the system of clitic pronouns in BP.¹² In fact, it is possible to show that in EP the preposition *a* is required under clitic doubling, with dative and accusative clitics (cf. (21)), as well as in the repair strategy involving the dative argument in double pronominalization (cf. (23)) – the analysis of the EP facts will be left open in the present analysis.¹³

The facts about BP in turn are analysed in Salles (1997) in terms of the projection of a lexical P denoting possession, as originally proposed in Kayne's (1984) and Pesetsky's (1995) analyses of the dative alternation in English, as well as in Hale and Keyser's (1993) seminal theory of argument structure, in which these predicates are projections of the lexical categories P and N. Assuming Manzini; Franco (2016) and Franco; Manzini's (2017) approach to oblique case, as formulated in section 1, the preposition *para* in BP is the lexicalization of a head denoting *inclusion/ possession*, which introduces the *goal* argument further establishing a relation with the *theme* argument, in the *vP* projection, under predication (cf. (24)).

(24) [_{VP} [_{DP} o livro] [_v [_{VP} deu [_{PP} [_{P(ε)} para [_{DP} o João/ ele]]]]]]]

Given the alignment of dative and benefactive constructions with respect to the use of the preposition *para*, the natural conclusion is that the beneficiary argument occur in a projection internal to VP in BP, as illustrated in (25). This conclusion is crucially based on Pylkkänen's (2002) distinction between high and low benefactives, in which it is postulated that they imply event modification and transfer of possession, respectively – the latter being the relevant interpretation in (25) (cf. note 9).¹⁴

(25) ...[_{VP} [_{DP} o bolo] [_v [_{VP} fez [_{PP} [_{P(ε)} para [_{DP} o João/ ele]]]]]]]

2.2. The loss of the preposition *a* in Dative/ DOM constructions in monotransitive predicates

As extensively discussed in Salles; Torres Morais (2020), another relevant feature of BP is the loss of the preposition *a* in dative/ DOM constructions in monotransitive predicates – although the preposition *a* remains with the (strong) third person pronoun. A common property of these predicates

¹² In (dialectal) BP, clitic doubling is found with the preposition *para/ pra*, with first and second person clitics, as illustrated in (i), in connection with other properties, such as the occurrence of Double Object Constructions (cf. DINIZ 2007; MACHADO 2016; BARROS, 2018; PEREIRA, 2019):

(i) Eu tô *te* falando *pra* você (...) 'I am 2s.CL speaking P_{para} you' (MACHADO-ROCHA, 2016, p. 113)

¹³ A recent trend of research postulates that the dative argument is introduced by a functional applicative head (cf. PYLKÄNEN, 2002; CUERVO, 2003; TORRES MORAIS, 2006; DIACONESCU; RIVERO, 2007; TORRES MORAIS; SALLES, 2010; PINEDA 2013; CALINDRO 2015, among many others). We shall leave aside the discussion of this proposal, pointing out with Manzini; Franco (2016) that the applicative model provides an alternative view to similar problems.

¹⁴ I refer the reader to Armelim (2011) and Calindro (2015, 2021), which are well-developed studies on the syntax of the preposition introducing dative and benefactive constructions in BP.

is that they select an animate DP.¹⁵

- (26) a. Obedecer [_{DP} o pai] ‘to obey the father’
 b. Obedecer [_{DP} ele] [_{PP} a [ele]]/ (*para) ‘to obey him/P_a-him’
- (27) a. Agradar [_{DP} o amigo] ‘to please his friend’
 b. Agradar [_{DP} ele] [_{PP} a [ele]]/ (*para) ‘to please him/P_a-him’
- (28) a. Servir [_{DP} o cliente] ‘to serve the client’
 b. Servir [_{DP} ele] [_{PP} a [ele]]/ (*para) ‘to serve him/P_a-him’
- (29) a. Chamar [_{DP} o aluno] ‘to call the student’
 b. Chamar [_{DP} ele] [_{PP} a [ele]]/ (*para) ‘to call him/P_a-him’

(data extracted from SALLES; TORRES MORAIS, 2020, pp. 477-8)

In some predicates, the dative P varies with the direct object, and the preposition *para* is semantically possible (cf. 30a-b); with a verb like ‘telefonar’ (to phone), the mapping as a direct object is excluded (cf. 31a-b):

- (30) a. Ensinar [o menino]/ [para [_{DP} o menino] ‘to teach the boy/ to the boy’
 b. Ensinar [_{DP} ele] [*para* ele] ‘to teach him/ to him’
- (31) a. Telefonar [para/ ao amigo] ‘to phone P_{to} the friend’
 b. Telefonar [a/ para ele] ‘to phone P_{to} him’

Assuming Manzini; Franco’s (2016) unified analysis of DOM constructions and dative case in terms of the projection of a lexical P denoting a possession/ inclusion relation, the conclusion is that in BP, the occurrence of the lexical P in monotransitive constructions is restricted to pronominal DPs – direct/ accusative objects being the preferred strategy. Moreover, due to the grammatical split affecting pronominalization in BP, the PP is only found with third person strong pronouns, first and second person pronouns being expressed by the clitic pronoun (namely *me* and *te*). The relevant configurations are the following:

- (32) ... [_{VP} EA obedecer [_{VP} [_{DP} o pai]]]
- (33) ... [_{VP} EA [CAUSE/ v [_{VP} obedecer [_{P(ε)} a ele]]]]

In the following section we will address the loss of the preposition *a* with motion verbs in BP (as compared to EP and other Romance languages), as well as the related substitution for the preposition *para* (to), further considering the occurrence of the preposition *em* (in), which points to an alignment in allative and inessive contexts.

¹⁵ I refer the reader to Ramos’s (1989) original study on the loss of the preposition *a* in BP in DOM contexts, in which word order rigidification is identified as a crucial factor.

2.3. More on the novel system of prepositions in BP: the case of motion verbs

As mentioned at the outset of this study a relevant fact about the syntax of prepositions in BP (as opposed to EP and other Romance languages) is the loss of the preposition *a* in predicates with motion verbs, such as *ir* (to go), *vir* (to come), *levar* (to take), the prepositions *para* (to) and *em* (in) occurring in these contexts. This is illustrated in (2a) and (2b), repeated as (34a) and (34b), with the verbs *ir* (to go) and *vir* (to come).

- (34) a. Maria foi *para* o mercado/ *no* mercado. (<ao mercado)
 M. went to the market/ P_{in} the market
 b. Maria veio *para*/ *no* mercado. (<ao mercado)
 M. came to/P_{in} the market

These facts are confirmed in various studies examining different varieties of BP within the Labovian approach, which have shown a stable variation between *para* and *em*, as well as a clear tendency to the loss of the preposition *a* in this context (cf. MOLLICA, 1995; WIEDEMER, 2015; CITÉLI; TESCH, 2021, among others). In EP the preposition *a* (to) is widely found, as well as the preposition *para* (to), while the preposition *em* (in) is excluded (cf. MATEUS *et al.*, 2003). Accordingly, the occurrence of the preposition *em* (in) with motion verbs can be considered an innovation of BP, as compared to EP. In this sense, BP displays an alignment with stative predicates with respect to the use of the preposition *em* (in), which can be formulated as an alignment in the grammatical encoding of allative and inessive case, as illustrated in (35), as opposed to (34a-b)¹⁶.

- (35) Maria está *no* mercado/ *em* Brasília
 M. is in-the marked/ in Brasília

The innovative facts about the prepositional system of BP with motion verbs are discussed in Farias (2005) within the generative framework, in terms of the idea that in this context, the preposition is a ‘half way’ category regarding the lexical and functional distinction, as it is an auxiliary predicate in assigning the locative theta role conjointly with the verb (V+P). According to the author, the formation of V+P is determined by the specification of the locative argument, which blocks the occurrence of the so-called ‘wild’ topicalization. As noted in Duarte (2003, cited by FARIAS, 2006, p. 230), this configuration requires referential and thematic connectivity, not categorial and casual identity), as illustrated in (36a) and (36b), as opposed to (37a) and (37b).

¹⁶ Other varieties of Portuguese display a similar phenomenon, such as Mozambican Portuguese (MP), as discussed in Gonçalves and Chimbutane (2004) (cf. (i)). In their analysis, the preposition occurring with motion predicates in MP is a functional category in a bilingual context, as it establishes a parallel with the locative marker in the corresponding construction of the Bantu language which is the first language (L1) (cf. also RABELO, 2016).

(i) Nem todos íamos *na* mesma escola. ‘Not all of us would go in-the same school’

- (36) a. O João foi *a/ para/ em* Lisboa (ungrammatical in PE with ‘em’ (in))
 J. went to/ in Lisbon
 b. *Lisboa, o João foi (examples from FARIAS, 2006, p. 231)
- (37) a. Eu não gosto dessa cerveja
 I do not like P_{of} this beer
 b. Essa cerveja, eu não gosto
 (examples from DUARTE, 2003, p. 501, cited by FARIAS, 2006, p. 230)

Considering Farias’ (2006) idea of analysing the preposition in motion verbs as a ‘half-way category’, we would like to point out that this condition translates in terms of Chomsky’s (1981) notion of inherent case, thus allowing for a unified account with the dative preposition ‘to’, in verbs such as ‘to promise’ (cf. section 1. 1).

Assuming that *ir* (to go) is a bi-argumental unaccusative (as well as other motion verbs) (cf. MUNHOZ; NAVES; SOUTO, 2016), this analysis amounts to saying that the spatial preposition introduces a relation between the *theme* argument and the *path/ endpoint* of the dislocation. Following Manzini; Franco (2016) and Franco; Manzini’s (2017) analyses of oblique case (cf. Section 1), we would like propose that this head denotes an *inclusion* relation in this syntact context as well (*location* being the relevant semantic feature, not possession). Whereas in the denotation of the *endpoint of the dislocation*, the inclusion head is (canonically) lexicalized by the prepositions *para* (to) and *em* (in), as illustrated in (38), in the denotation of the *path of the dislocation* it is (canonically) lexicalized by *por/per* (across), as illustrated in (39), thus implying that the lexical properties of P are restricted by the lexical properties of the locative DP (as pointed out in FARIAS, 2006, above).

(38) [_{VP} ir [_{PP} [_{DP} Maria_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *em/para* [_{DP} o mercado_{LOC}]]]]

(39) [_{VP} ir [_{PP} [_{DP} Maria_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *per* [_{DP} a ponte_{LOC}]]]] (=pela ponte/ across the bridge)

This analysis extends to the motion verb *chegar* (to arrive), in which the preposition *em* (in) introduces a relation between the *theme* argument and the *locative* argument denoting the endpoint of the dislocation, whereas *por/per* (across) denotes the path of the dislocation, as illustrated in (40) (cf. SOUTO, 2016).

(40) a. [_{VP} chegar [_{PP} [_{DP} Maria_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *em* [_{DP} o mercado_{LOC}]]]]

b. [_{VP} chegar [_{PP} [_{DP} Maria_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *per* [_{DP} a ponte_{LOC}]]]] (=pela ponte)

In turn, in stative predicates with the (stage level) auxiliary *estar*, which is a raising predicate, the preposition denotes an inclusion relation between the *theme* argument and the locative DP, the interpretation being determined exclusively by the lexical properties of the preposition, giving rise to

the inessive interpretation if the preposition is *em* (in), as illustrated in (41). Other denotations arise depending on the preposition – *path of the dislocation*, if it is *por/per* (across), as illustrated in (42), *end of the dislocation*, if it is *para* (to), as illustrated in (43) (the latter denoting a state of dislocation in a path and towards an endpoint).

- (41) [_{TP} [_{T/AUX} *estar* [_{DP} *Maria*_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *em* [_{DP} *o mercado*_{LOC}]]]]] (=no mercado)
- (42) [_{TP} [_{T/AUX} *estar* [_{DP} *Maria*_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *per* [_{DP} *o mercado*_{LOC}]]]]] (=pelo mercado)
- (43) [_{TP} [_{T/AUX} *estar* [_{DP} *Maria*_{THEME}] [_{P(ε)} *para* [_{DP} *o mercado*_{LOC}]]]]]

A related property regarding spatial prepositions is that they have been analysed as projecting an internal structure, in which the locative meaning is decomposed in two basic nodes, namely PlaceP (locative) and PathP (directional), these properties being projected in the layered structure [PathP [PlaceP]] – hence directional P (*a/para*) is morphologically more complex than locative P (*em*) (cf. KOOPMAN, 2002, 2010; HELMANTEL, 2002; SVENONIUS, 2007, among many others). This approach is explored in Souto's (2016) analysis of the motion verb *ir* (to go), in which an account for the alignment between the preposition *para* (to) and *em* (in) in this context is provided, taking into consideration Ramchand's (2008) idea that PP occurs as a rhematic projection in the structure of different event types.¹⁷

3. Final remarks

We have seen that a unifying property concerning the grammatical licensing of the (dative) DP in both ditransitive and monotransitive predicates is that they are all animate. This property gives rise to different grammatical encodings within the Romance stock. A relevant fact is that variation is found with respect to the occurrence of oblique case, introduced by P, as opposed to accusative case (cf. PINEDA, 2013, on CATALAN).

Following Manzini; Franco (2016) and Franco; Manzini's (2017) analyses on oblique case (cf. Section 1), we assumed that, in ditransitive predicates, a P head expressing *possession/ inclusion* introduces the goal argument/participant in BP (an approach that goes back to previous analyses postulating a prepositional head introducing the *theme* and the *goal* argument). By hypothesis, this analysis extends to *goal* arguments in monotransitive predicates, as well as to constructions involving Differential Object Marking (DOM). In particular, the *goal* argument enters a relation with a subevent in the structure of the predicate, thus allowing for a uniform account for these predicates, as involving an oblique case.

It was further shown that a structural alignment arises between the *goal* argument in ditransitive predicates and the *benefactive* argument in BP, as they are both introduced by the preposition *para*,

¹⁷ The idea of a layered configuration is assumed in Calindro's (2015) analysis of dative prepositions in BP, in which a little *p* hosts FIGURE (*theme*), and P hosts GROUND, following an original proposal in Wood (2012), cited by the author.

allowing for a unified analysis in terms of the projection of a *possession/ inclusion* relation with the *theme* argument. In monotransitive predicates, the innovation consists in the absence of P as a grammatical category introducing the internal/ goal argument, thus implying the absence of animacy/ specificity marking. Consequently, the internal argument is assigned direct case, under the *Agree* operation (cf. CHOMSKY, 2001).

In turn, pronominalization gives rise to different patterns, as a residual occurrence of DP marking by *a* is found with the third person (full) pronoun *ele(s)/ ela(s)*, as opposed to the occurrence of first and second person clitics (which remain productive, pointing to a split pronominal system in BP). The facts concerning the third person were analysed in terms of Manzini; Franco's (2016) account of dative DP/DOM, the preposition *a* lexicalizing the *possession/ inclusion* relation. In Manzini; Franco's (2016) terms, the absence of P in BP implies that argument licensing is not sensitive to the internal structure of the event/ state, namely to its subparts. Conversely, animacy/ specificity marking by P amounts to sensitivity to the structure of the event/state.

Regarding motion verbs it is shown that BP displays a variable use of the prepositions 'para' (to/ for) and 'em' (in), the latter being an innovative use, as it is not found in EP. Accordingly, an alignment arises in the use of the preposition 'em' (in) in predicates with motion verbs and stative predicates. A unifying property that can be drawn with respect to the losses and innovative alignments in the syntax of prepositions introducing (monotransitive / ditransitive) DOM/goals and locative arguments in BP is that they all converge to argument embedding. As shown in the present analysis, the innovative alignments in this context imply "an underlying (syntactic and interpretive) identity", as pointed out in Manzini; Franco (2016, p. 198), in which (oblique) case reduces to predicative categories denoting *possession/ inclusion*.

In this sense, the nature of the relation between locatives and possession must be drawn. According to Franco; Manzini (2017), locatives should be taken as specification in the inclusion zone, not the inverse. This idea can be discussed in terms of Jackendoff's (1993, p. 62) proposal that possession should be seen as a cognitive primitive – not as "a suitable extension or abstraction or progression from the understanding of location and motion in space" – as proposed in the localist view. A relevant result is that the above-mentioned models of spatial PP internal structure can be maintained, as formal specifications of the *possession/ inclusion* relation. Other preposition alignments involving the use of prepositions in BP support this approach, as in the substitution of the preposition *em* (in) for *a* (to) in ditransitive predicates involving a nominal *theme* denoting an event, as in *dar um beijo no filho (<ao filho)* (give his son a kiss), in which both dative and locative meaning converge. We leave the discussion of these constructions for future research.

References

ARMELIM, Paula Roberta G. *Sentenças bitransitivas do português do Brasil revisitadas à luz da teoria dos núcleos aplicativos*. Dissertação de Mestrado, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2011.

- BARROS, Isis Juliana F. de. *O dativo em construções ditransitivas nas atas oitocentistas da Sociedade Protetora dos Desvalidos: um estudo sob a proposta dos núcleos aplicativos*. Dissertação, Universidade Federal da Bahia, 170p., Salvador, 2013.
- BELVIN, Robert; DEN DIKKEN, Marcel. There, happens, to be, have. *Lingua* vol. 101, Issues 3-4, pp. 151-83, 1997.
- BERLINCK, Rosane. Datives. In: VAN BELLE, William; VAN LANGENDOMCK, Willy (eds.) *The Dative*, 1 Descriptive Studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996, pp. 119-51.
- CAHA, Pavel. *The nanosyntax of case*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics (CASTL). Tromsø, 2009.
- CALINDRO, Ana R. *Introduzindo argumentos: Uma proposta para as sentenças ditransitivas do português brasileiro*. Tese de doutorado, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2015.
- CALINDRO, Ana R. The *i** single argument introducer: a solution for representing the beneficiary argument of creation verbs in Brazilian Portuguese. In: TANASE-DOGARU, Mihaela *et al.* *(De)Constructing Language Structure and Meaning. Studies on Syntax, Semantics and Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2021, pp. 45-75.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. *Knowledge of language*. Its nature, origin and use. New York: Praeger, 1986.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press, 1995.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. Derivation by phase, In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001, pp. 1-52.
- CHOMSKY, Noam. *On phases*. ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 2004.
- CITÉLI, Bárbara Gomes; TESCH, Leila Maria. A regência variável do verbo de movimento ir na fala capixaba: o comportamento de fatores extralinguísticos. *Diadorim*, v. 23, n. 1, pp. 222-44, junho-julho, 2021.
- CUERVO, María Cristina. *Datives at large*. PhD Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 2003.
- DIACONESCU, Constanta R.; RIVERO, Maria Luísa. An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian. *Probus* v. 19, pp. 171-95, 2007.
- DINIZ, Carolina R. “*Eu te amo você*” – O redobro de pronomes clíticos sob uma abordagem minimalista. Dissertação de mestrado. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2007.
- FARIAS, Jair. Variação entre *a*, *para* e *em* no português brasileiro e no português europeu: algumas notas. *Letras de Hoje*, Porto Alegre, v. 41, n. 1. pp. 213-34, 2006.

- FIGUEIREDO SILVA, Maria Cristina. A perda do marcador dativo e algumas de suas consequências. In: CASTILHO, Ataliba; TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida; LOPES, Ruth; CYRINO, Sônia (orgs.). *Descrição, história e aquisição do português*. Campinas, Pontes Editora, 2007, pp. 85-110.
- FRANCO, Ludovico; MANZINI, Maria Rita. Instrumental prepositions and case: Contexts of occurrences and alternations with datives. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, v. 2, n. 1, pp. 1-37, 2017.
- GALVES, Charlotte. *Ensaio sobre as gramáticas do português*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2001.
- GOMES, Christina A. Variação e mudança na expressão do dativo no português brasileiro. In: PAIVA, Maria Conceição; DUARTE, Maria Eugênia (eds.). *Mudança Linguística em Tempo Real*. Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/Contra Capa, 2003, pp. 81-96.
- GONÇALVES, Perpétua; CHIMBUTANE, Feliciano. O papel das línguas Bantu na gênese do português de Moçambique: o comportamento sintático de constituintes locativo e direcionais. *PAPIA*, n. 14, pp. 7-30, 2004.
- HALE, Kenneth; KEYSER, Samuel Jay. On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations. In: HALE, Kenneth L.; KEYSER, Samuel Jay (eds.). *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, MIT Press: pp. 53-109, 1993.
- HARLEY, Heidi. Possession and the double object construction. In: *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 2 (1), pp. 31-70, 2002.
- HELMANTEL, Marjon. *Interactions in the Dutch adpositional domain*. Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap, 2002.
- JACKENDOFF, Ray. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990.
- JACKENDOFF, Ray. *Languages of the mind. Essays on mental representation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993.
- KAYNE, Richard. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht, Foris, 1984.
- KOOPMAN, Hilda. Prepositions, Postpositions, Circumpositions, and Particles: the structure of Dutch PPs. In: KOOPMAN, Hilda (ed.) *The Syntax of Specifiers and Heads*. Collected Essays of Hilda J. Koopman, London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 204-60.
- KOOPMAN, Hilda. Projections of P. In: *Syntax and Semantics of Spatial P*, ed. ASBURY, Anna et al. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 63-84. 2008.
- MACHADO-ROCHA, Ricardo. *O redobro de clítico no português brasileiro dialetal*. 2016. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte/MG, 2016.
- MANZINI, Maria Rita; FRANCO, Ludovico. Goal and DOM datives. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 34, pp. 197-240, 2016.
- MATEUS, Maria Helena M. et al. *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. 5. ed. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho, 2003, pp. 181-203.

MOLLICA, Maria Cecília de M. A regência variável do verbo ‘ir’ de movimento. In: Silva, G. M. O.; SCHERRE, M. M. P. (org.) *Padrões sociolinguísticos: análise de fenômenos variáveis do português falado no Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, pp. 147-67, 1996.

MUNHOZ, Ana Terra; NAVES, Rozana R. Construções de tópico-sujeito: uma proposta em termos de estrutura argumental e de transferência de traços de C. *Signum. Estudos de Linguagem* v. 15, pp. 245-65, 2012.

PESETSKY, David. *Zero Syntax: Experiencers and Cascades*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.

PESETSKY, David; TORREGO, Ester. Case. In: BOECZX, Cedrix. *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Minimalism*. OUP, 2011.

PEREIRA, Manoel B. *Predicados bitransitivos do português dialetal do Brasil Central (PBC)*. Construções de objeto duplo e de redobro do clítico. Tese de Doutorado, 192p., Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2019.

PINEDA, Anna. Double object constructions and dative/accusative alternations in Spanish and Catalan: A unified account. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, v. 2, pp. 57-115, 2013.

PYLKÄNNEN, Lina. *Introducing arguments*. PH. D thesis. MIT, 2002.

RABÊLO, Sarah Freitas. *Sintagmas locativas no português de Moçambique e no português do Brasil: o papel do contato de línguas*. MA Dissertation. Universidade de Brasília (UnB), 2016.

RAMCHAND, Gillian C. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: a first phase syntax*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

RAMOS, Jânia. O emprego de preposições no português do Brasil. In: TARALLO, Fernando (org.). *Fotografias Sociolinguísticas*. São Paulo: Pontos, 1989, pp. 83-93.

RAMOS, Jânia. *Marcação sintática e mudança sintática no português*. Tese (Doutorado). 1992. Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 1992.

RAPOSO, Eduardo. Verbo e Sintagma Verbal. In: RAPOSO, Eduardo et al. (coords.) *Gramática do Português*. Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2, pp. 1155-80, 2013.

RIEMSDJIK, Henk van. *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1978.

RIEMSDJIK, Henk van. Functional prepositions. In: PINKSTER, Harm; Pinkster and Ige Genee (eds) *Unity in Diversity: Papers Presented to Simon C. Dik on his 60th Birthday*, pp. 229-41. Dordrecht: Foris, 1983.

ROBERTS, Ian G.; KATO, Mary A. *O português brasileiro, uma viagem diacrônica*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 1993.

SALLES, Heloisa Maria M. L. *Prepositions and the syntax of complementation*. PhD Thesis. 158p., 1997. University of Wales, Bangor, 1997.

SALLES, Heloisa Maria M. L. The syntax of (ditransitive) predicates of transference in dialectal Brazilian Portuguese. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali*, 2, 2016, pp. 79-96.

SALLES, Heloisa Maria M. L.; SCHERRE, Maria Marta P. Indirect Objects in Brazilian Portuguese and in English. In: NÚÑEZ-CEDENO, R.; L. L. CAMERON (eds.) *A Romance Perspective in Language Knowledge and Use – Selected Papers from the 31st LSRL*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 2003, pp. 151-65.

SALLES, Heloisa Maria M. L.; TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida. Estrutura argumental no português brasileiro: perdas e alinhamentos inovadores nos sistemas pronominal e preposicional. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL*, v. 12, n. 2, pp. 467-90, 2020.

SVENONIUS, Peter. Spatial P in English. In: *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, CINQUE, Guglielmo; RIZZI, Luigi (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

SOUTO, Keli Cristiane. *Categorias lexicais e funcionais no licenciamento de verbos de trajetória: o caso do verbo 'ir'*. Tese de doutorado, 153p., Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2016.

TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida. Um cenário para o núcleo aplicativo no português europeu. *ABRALIN* v. 5, pp. 239-66, 2006.

TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida; BERLINCK, Rosane. O objeto indireto: argumentos aplicados e preposicionados. In: CYRINO, Sônia; TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida (orgs.) *Mudança sintática do português brasileiro: perspectiva gerativista*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2018, pp. 252-307.

TORRES MORAIS, Maria Aparecida; SALLES, Heloisa Maria M. L. Parametric change in the grammatical encoding of indirect objects in Brazilian Portuguese. *Probus*, v. 22, n. 2, pp. 181-209, 2010.

WIEDEMER, Marcos Luís. Um retrato sociolinguístico da realização das preposições de complementos de verbos de movimento no português falado no interior paulista. *Estudos Linguísticos*. São Paulo, v. 44, n. 1, pp. 438-53, 2015.